

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Family Science

Trent W. Maurer
Georgia Southern University

David D. Law
Utah State University

ABSTRACT. This is the introductory article for this special issue on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) in family science. First, the article presents an overview of SoTL and its intersection with family science along with definition and conceptualization of SoTL. Next, there is explanation of different models for evaluating SoTL scholarship. Third, there is description of a typology of the scholarly questions that can be asked in SoTL. After reviewing these typologies, the article focuses on reviewing SoTL specifically in family science, documenting benefits of engaging in SoTL scholarship, and describing how family scientists are in unique positions to make meaningful contributions to SoTL. The article concludes with concrete recommendations for advancing SoTL in family science.

Keywords: Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SoTL), Family Science

Direct correspondence to Trent W. Maurer at tmaurer@georgiasouthern.edu

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Family Science

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) “involves systematic study of teaching and/or learning and the public sharing and review of such work through presentations, performance, or publications” (McKinney, 2006, p. 39). This article presents an overview of SoTL scholarship and its intersections with family science. First, we discuss various definitions and conceptualizations of SoTL. Next, we present different models for evaluating SoTL scholarship. Third, we outline different types of scholarly questions one can ask with SoTL. Fourth, we give specific examples of what SoTL in family science looks like. Fifth, we present documented benefits of engaging in SoTL scholarship. Sixth, we identify unique contributions family scientists can make to SoTL. Seventh, we provide general resources for conducting SoTL scholarship. Finally, we offer recommendations for advancing SoTL in family science.

Definitions and Conceptualizations of SoTL

Ernest Boyer is credited with coining the term “Scholarship of Teaching” in his seminal work *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990). Describing his “Scholarship of Teaching,” Boyer said, “The work of the professor becomes consequential only as it is understood by others. . . . When defined as *scholarship*, however, teaching both educates and entices future scholars” (p. 23). Unfortunately, Boyer did not distinguish between *scholarly teaching* and the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, which muddies the distinction between teaching and research on teaching (Richlin, 2001; Shulman, 2000). Furthermore, since SoTL is focused on inquiry into the teaching and learning process, people unfamiliar with SoTL frequently mischaracterize and misidentify SoTL as teaching instead of research. McKinney’s (2003) three-part model of scholarly teaching addressed these issues explicitly and clarified differences among *good teaching*, *scholarly teaching*, and *SoTL*.

1. *Good teaching* is that which enables students to learn.
2. *Scholarly teaching* is that which uses evidence about the teaching-learning connection and best practices in pedagogy to further enhance student learning.
3. The *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* (SoTL) is actually producing and disseminating new evidence about teaching and learning in peer-reviewed fora for other teachers to use in their own scholarly teaching, much the same way scholars contribute to the disciplinary knowledge base with disciplinary research.

However, multiple definitions of SoTL abound and the interdisciplinary SoTL community still lacks a consensus definition (McKinney, 2015). McKinney’s (2006) definition provided above is the most succinct, but it is also unintentionally narrow because it recognizes only traditional forms of peer-reviewed dissemination. Within the interdisciplinary SoTL community, there have been calls for an inclusive “big tent” approach to defining and recognizing SoTL (Huber & Hutchings, 2005; Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011). This approach refers to the field’s openness to multiple forms of inquiry (including documentation and reflection) and not just to inquiry on student learning.

One frequently cited definition of SoTL is from Hutchings and Shulman (1999): [A] scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching. It requires a kind of "going meta," in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning—the conditions under which it occurs, what it looks like, how to deepen it, and so forth—and do so with an eye not only to improving their own classroom but to advancing practice beyond it. (p. 13)

Some have proposed longer and more nuanced definitions. For example, Potter and Kustra (2011), defined SoTL as

the systematic study of teaching and learning, using established or validated criteria of scholarship, to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviours, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning, and/or develop a more accurate understanding of learning, resulting in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community. (p. 2)

Most SoTL definitions have three key elements: (a) systematic approach to studying teaching and learning using appropriate scholarly methods; (b) peer review of the product; and (c) public sharing or dissemination of the product to appropriate audiences, particularly for use in future teaching and SoTL research (cf. McKinney, 2007).

Evaluating and Determining the Impact of SoTL

When Boyer (1990) introduced "Scholarship of Teaching" he argued that higher education institutions should recognize and reward this type of scholarship. To do so requires evaluating SoTL like any other form of scholarship. Fortunately, SoTL can be evaluated (to an extent) using the same evaluation criteria applied to traditional disciplinary research. Specifically, one can evaluate SoTL scholarship on the same basis as scholarly and creative activity by using criteria outlined in Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff's (1997) *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. Those criteria are (a) clear goals, (b) adequate preparation, (c) appropriate methods, (d) significant results, (e) effective presentation, and (f) reflective critique.

However, scholars have articulated *additional* criteria for evaluating SoTL scholarship. Felten (2013) listed five principles of good practice in SoTL: (a) inquiry should be focused on student learning, (b) scholarship should be grounded in context, (c) scholarship should be methodologically sound, (d) inquiry should be conducted in partnership with students, and (e) results should be made appropriately public. These five principles are echoed in review criteria of major international interdisciplinary SoTL journals like the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning's (ISSOTL) flagship publication *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*. The first, third, and fifth principles echo key elements of SoTL definitions identified above, but the second and fourth principles require elaboration.

With respect to grounding in context, Felten (2013) described the importance of scholarly context (relevant prior research, theory, and practice) and local context (classroom, disciplinary, institutional, and cultural). The scholarly context piece mirrors Glassick et al.'s (1997) adequate preparation criteria, but the local context piece represents a new criterion. Grounding SoTL scholarship in local context requires scholars to be aware of and discuss how contextual factors could have influenced their scholarship and affected its generalizability. For example, a disproportionate amount of SoTL research in the US is conducted at institutions classified as Master's Colleges and Universities or below in the Carnegie classification system, where faculty members teach more and smaller undergraduate classes and there is limited institutional support for research (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002; Gurung, Ansbarg, Alexander, Lawrence, & Johnson, 2008). SoTL projects at these institutions may not translate fully to Research Institutions, where faculty teach fewer and larger undergraduate classes, often with assistance from graduate students. Additionally, unique cultural issues may affect the results of or even the need for specific SoTL investigations (see Maurer, 2013 for an example).

Recently, partnering with students for inquiry into student learning has been a major focus in the international interdisciplinary SoTL community (Healey, Flint, & Harrington, 2014; Werder & Otis, 2009). ISSOTL has two special interest member groups dedicated to this focus: students as co-inquirers and student engagement. Although partnering with students as co-inquirers is not always possible, practical, or even desirable, creating greater "ownership" of research among student participants and giving special attention to students' voices about the research are guiding principles.

Distinct from evaluating SoTL research is the question of how to determine its impact. For many scholars, research impact centers on peer-reviewed scholarly journal publications: how many publications, in which journals, and how often are they cited? Unfortunately, these metrics do not translate to measuring the impact of SoTL scholarship. Felten (2013) explains.

[E]ven for the best, most rigorous SoTL projects, the appropriate location for and approach to "going public" can be uncertain. . . influential SoTL in the US often has *not* appeared in traditional scholarly venues, but rather flowed through less formal networks of scholars inquiring into student learning. For these reasons, the SoTL community cannot and should not rely exclusively on the typical method of judging scholarly quality, publication in top-tier peer-reviewed journals. . . Because SoTL inquiry typically is iterative and highly contextual, the most appropriate ways to go public should capture and reflect the evolving nature of this form of research. In many cases, that is not possible in a traditional scholarly journal. (pp. 122-124)

McKinney (2012) takes this point further, arguing that scholars should view the primary audience for SoTL research not as other SoTL scholars or teachers, but also as *students* because the SoTL focus is ultimately on student learning. As an extension of Felten's (2013) fourth principle of conducting SoTL research in partnership with students, McKinney argues that SoTL scholars must "close the loop," i.e., share results of SoTL research with students and "help them reflect and apply those findings to their own efforts to improve learning" (p. 3). This

recommendation belies the application and practice-based focus of SoTL research. Although SoTL research has value in terms of building a literature and guiding future research (e.g., citations, etc.), its primary value is its impact on other teachers' *teaching* and on their students' *learning*. This impact cannot be captured by traditional metrics. Using these metrics to assess the impact of SoTL reveals fundamental misunderstanding of the goals and purposes of SoTL.

Furthermore, even for SoTL published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals, multiple issues unique to SoTL prevent traditional citation metrics from being helpful in determining impact of SoTL scholarship (Csete & Li, 2015). For example, there is no specific category for SoTL in the Web of Science index. SoTL journals often are not indexed at all. Journal Citation Reports' impact factors and citation counts only include publications in journals indexed in Web of Science. Therefore, publications in unindexed SoTL journals are not counted regardless of the numbers of citations. How does an article published in *Family Science Review* compare with an article in *The International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*? Since both journals are unindexed in Web of Science, there is no way to use these metrics to compare the two. Further complicating the issue is the interdisciplinary approach of SoTL. Comparing citation metrics across disciplines is notoriously problematic (e.g., different citation patterns and numbers of citations, size of field, indexing of other relevant journals in Web of Science). How does an article published in *Family Science Review* compare with an article in *Teaching of Psychology* or *Journal of Chemical Education*? Even if all three journals were indexed, such comparisons would be misleading. Inability to use these citation metrics to determine impact of SoTL research may be a significant barrier to more scholars conducting SoTL, particularly those at Research Institutions where reliance on these metrics is more widespread (however, see Reinke, Muraco, & Maurer, 2016, for an exception).

Typology of SoTL Questions

Scholarly questions in SoTL can be classified into four types (Hutchings, 2000): (a) What works?, (b) What is?, (c) Visions of the possible, and (d) Theory building. "What works?" questions are about evaluating effectiveness of various teaching methods or approaches. Is the method achieving goals for student learning that the faculty member has set? How does student learning from this method compare to student learning from alternative methods for teaching the same material? For example, Maurer and Lee (2011) compared two types of financial literacy education--traditional classroom instruction and peer-led instruction--to determine if one method were more effective than the other for teaching specific financial literacy concepts in family science. Often, "What works?" questions are the "entry point" to SoTL for new SoTL scholars. The questions represent a more systematic way of investigating their teaching and their students' learning, when compared to relying on their own anecdotal reflections on the education process.

"What is?" questions seek to describe teaching and learning in a non-evaluative way. Rather than "Is it working?," these questions ask, "What does it look like?" For example, what goes on in a laboratory preschool classroom? How do college lab students interact in those settings? Descriptive answers to such questions may help identify what to investigate. From there, "What works?" questions may be developed. This is not to imply that the only value in descriptive "What is?" questions is as a means to asking "What works?" questions. Rich

descriptions of teaching and learning environments and settings are inherently valuable to teachers, students, administrators, accreditors, prospective students and their parents, to name just a few of the groups important to the process.

“Visions of the possible” are questions that seek to break new ground and challenge the status quo by asking, “What *could* it look like if. . .?” On a more micro level, an instance of visions of the possible might be a faculty member trying (and evaluating) a new way to teach a specific topic or course that others in the field have created, but are new to this faculty member. On a more macro level, there could be development (and evaluation) of new ways to teach a specific topic or course, different from anything previously attempted in the field (which could include adapting ideas from other fields). Building on the work of Maurer and Lee (2011), Maurer (2014a, 2014b), adapted Process-Oriented Guided-Inquiry Learning [POGIL] from the natural sciences to create a new method for teaching financial literacy education.

“Theory building” refers to building theoretical frameworks and conceptual models for SoTL and creating ways of making meaning out of what teachers and students do together. Like all theory, SoTL theories provide method and context for how to make sense of and interpret research findings. As Hutchings (2007) notes, much SoTL work is atheoretical and there is a clear need for more theory building. Furthermore, there is tension within the SoTL community about which theories to use and what is the appropriate balance between theories from literature on student learning, and disciplinary theories, especially in the social sciences. In this area, SoTL research is rare and desperately needed.

SoTL in Family Science

SoTL is still relatively new to family science, as shown by its limited presence at the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR) (DiGregorio, Maurer, and Pattanaik, 2016) and a small number of practitioners in the field (Reinke et al., 2016). Evidence from Reinke et al. (2016) also suggests that much family science SoTL research is disseminated outside the family science field, notably at interdisciplinary teaching and learning conferences and journals. As a result, searching for SoTL research in family science requires looking beyond our own disciplinary SoTL journal (i.e., *Family Science Review*), even though examples of SoTL in family science abound there (e.g., Maurer, 2006a, 2006b; Maurer & Rouse-Arnett, 2006). We must include family science non-SoTL journals, SoTL journals in other fields, and interdisciplinary SoTL journals to get a full picture of what family science SoTL looks like. We present several brief examples below.

Family science non-SoTL journals that have included SoTL research include *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* (e.g., Maurer & Lee, 2011, described above) and *Family Relations* (e.g., Kuvalanka, Goldberg, & Oswald, 2013). Kuvalanka et al. (2013) described instructor challenges and strategies for incorporating LGBTQ issues into family courses, which is a “What is?” question about teaching controversial issues in family science.

SoTL journals from other fields have also published family science SoTL research. *Journal of Financial Education* published the Maurer (2014b) adaptation of POGIL to family

science described above. *Teaching of Psychology* has also published family science SoTL research. Maurer (2006c) tested two competing theoretical explanations for the relationship between student grades and course evaluation scores in family science classrooms. *Teaching Sociology* has published exercises to promote cross-cultural understanding of families (Hare, 1999).

Interdisciplinary SoTL journals are also potential sources of family science SoTL research. *The International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* has published family science SoTL research on the use of reading guides to boost student learning in family science courses (Maurer & Longfield, 2015). *Teaching and Learning Inquiry* has published family science SoTL research on the impact of using the immediate feedback assessment technique for quizzes and exams on course evaluation scores (Maurer & Kropp, 2015).

The presence of family science SoTL research outside family science journals demonstrates the sharing of important family science SoTL work with the larger interdisciplinary SoTL community, rather than just among fellow family scientists. By taking this research to a larger interdisciplinary SoTL community, SoTL-active family scientists are creating visibility for family science in the SoTL community and establishing a place for family science within that community. Unless the family science field is aware of these outlets for family science SoTL research, important findings from that research may go unknown and unused in teaching and in future SoTL research.

Benefits of Engaging in SoTL

Engaging in SoTL research has many benefits for SoTL scholars themselves and for others. Shulman (2000), identifies three basic justifications for SoTL research: (a) professionalism, (b) pragmatism, and (c) policy. Professionalism refers to faculty members' obligations as scholars to do scholarly work and to share that work with the larger community of scholars. In this sense, SoTL is no different from disciplinary family science research--we do research about things that interest us because that is, by definition, what scholars *do*. This aligns with Kreber's (2013) concept of *intrinsic motivation* for engaging in SoTL: in response to an internal drive or desire. SoTL scholars do SoTL research to answer questions about teaching and learning they find intriguing.

Pragmatism refers to faculty members' needs as teachers to meet obligations for promoting student learning. We should do SoTL because it helps the broader teaching community and us be better teachers. SoTL has potential to enhance or improve teaching, to serve as a conduit through which faculty can teach more knowledgeably, and for enhancing students' learning experiences (Trigwell, 2013). These functions have become more important amidst national calls for greater focus on teaching by university faculty (Gunn, Kurtz, Lauridsen, Maurer, & Steele, 2010; Inside Higher Ed, 2015). Although this justification may align with Kreber's (2013) concept of *extrinsic motivation* for engaging in SoTL (in response to an external demand or reward), many SoTL scholars find that the justification aligns more frequently with her concept of *authentic professional motivation*--to serve the needs of students. SoTL scholars engage in SoTL scholarship because it helps them and other teachers to meet the needs of students better and more authentically. As McKinney (2012) notes, students are arguably the

most important consumers of SoTL research because they stand to benefit the most from that research. Additionally, Shulman (2005) argues that when pedagogical practices that pervade a discipline or subject are shared across disciplinary boundaries (such as through SoTL), this enriches academic communities and culture of teaching practice. As an interdisciplinary field (Hamon & Smith, 2014; Smart, 2009), family science is situated unusually well to benefit from such sharing.

Policy refers to the need for faculty members to respond to ever-increasing administrative, legislative, and public demands for higher education. We should do SoTL because the results of SoTL research help inform administrative and legislative policies and mandates, provide data for assessment and accreditation, and demonstrate for the public that faculty at institutions of higher education focus on promoting student learning in increasingly effective ways.

Bernstein (2013) echoes this last point about policy, describing SoTL-active faculty as “cosmopolitan assets” to their institutions because they “generate visible analyses of student learning taking place in their institutions, provide excellent models of practice for local colleagues, generate high-quality evidence for internal and external assessment, and offer accessible examples of quality education to prospective students” (p. 35). Similarly, Trigwell (2013) noted that among the articulated benefits of SoTL, SoTL may serve as a way to raise the status of teaching (relative to research), as a means to assess teaching quality, and even as a means to enhance a department’s research profile. All items on Bernstein’s and Trigwell’s lists are benefits beyond the faculty member herself. They benefit faculty colleagues, accreditation and assessment efforts, and institutional priorities, and they even help with recruiting students. Benefits of SoTL are not limited to the SoTL scholar, but instead, they extend to a wide range of audiences and constituencies that are critical to the success of higher education.

What Family Scientists Can Uniquely Contribute to SoTL

SoTL, like family science, is interdisciplinary (Cushman, 2015; Hamon & Smith, 2014; Huber & Morreale, 2002; Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; Smart, 2009). Scholars from any discipline can contribute to the wider SoTL literature and community. Family scientists, however, are especially well-positioned to make unique contributions to SoTL in four areas. Through their work in these four areas, family scientists could leave definitive footprints on SoTL. These would not just improve SoTL; they would also raise the visibility of family science within that audience and its constituents.

First, family scientists are experienced with complexities of defining boundaries of a “fuzzy” field and with determining who is “in” and “out” of the field. In the broader SoTL community there is a “big tent” debate about what is and is not SoTL, about who gets to claim identity as a SoTL scholar, and about how to understand the simultaneous holding of multiple disciplinary identities, such as SoTL scholar and chemist (Chick & Poole, 2014; Huber & Hutchings, 2005; Hutchings et al., 2011). In family science, we also lack a clear identity, even in the form of a name, with only 4% of respondents from recognized marriage and family programs self-identifying as “family scientists,” the second most common label among 200 (Hans, 2014).

NCFR members hail from more than 25 disciplines; only half of NCFR's members hold at least one degree in family science (Cushman, 2015). Many family scientists also identify as sociologists, anthropologists, and marriage and family therapists. They must navigate simultaneously holding multiple professional identities. These "identity issues" were rated the largest challenge facing family scientists (Hamon & Smith, 2014). We also share conflict and tension between broader and narrower definitions of "family scientists" (Gavazzi, Wilson, Ganong, & Zvonkovic, 2014), in the same way that SoTL experiences that tension between broader and narrower definitions of SoTL (Chick & Poole, 2014; Huber & Hutchings, 2005; Hutchings et al., 2011). Family science may not have resolved these issues for our field, but our experiences with and scholarship on these issues could inform the debate in SoTL in a unique way -- a way that engineering or history or chemistry could not offer.

Second, and relevant to the previous issue, family scientists have extensive experience with scholarship of integration (Boyer, 1990) and with searching and bringing together disparate literatures into a cohesive whole. Hamon and Smith (2014) explain, "as an 'interdisciplinary' discipline, family science assumes an inclusive approach that integrates and synthesizes research on families from a variety of traditional fields" (p. 316). This experience with scholarship of integration should make it relatively easier for family scientists to integrate family science research into SoTL and vice versa. Furthermore, the interdisciplinary nature of SoTL means that SoTL must draw from and build on scholarship of integration (Cross & Steadman, 1996; Kreber, 2013). Family scientists could lead in these efforts and even help with integrating findings across multiple fields (including those outside of family science's sphere) into the SoTL literature. This last point is especially important because NCFR members represent more than two dozen disciplines (Cushman, 2015), each with its own literature, theory, epistemology, and methods, and potentially, its own SoTL literature. Family science could form a nexus for SoTL research in much the same way it has formed a nexus for research on families.

Third, family science is home to multiple research methodologies, both quantitative and qualitative (and mixed method). A quick survey of articles published in NCFR journals reveals this diversity of approaches. The diversity also extends to family science SoTL research (DiGregorio et al., 2016; Reinke et al., 2016). Within the broader SoTL community, there is extensive discussion about appropriate methodologies and tension over the appropriate place for non-quantitative, non-positivist methodologies (Chick, 2013; Gurung, 2014). There is controversy despite the fact that accepted principles for good SoTL practice do not require empirical approaches (Felten, 2013). Although family science has not resolved this tension within our field, our experiences with and scholarship on this issue could inform the debate meaningfully.

Finally, family scientists are no strangers to advocacy. As members of a relatively young discipline, family scientists must constantly explain who they are, what they do, why their work has value, and why they should exist as family scientists rather than be subsumed within other disciplines (Gavazzi, 2013; Gavazzi et al., 2014; Hamon & Smith, 2014). This need to advocate for our field and its value is part and parcel of being a family scientist. The same is true of SoTL. That is why so much SoTL scholarship has been written to document the value of SoTL (e.g., Bernstein, 2013; Hutchings et al., 2013; Shulman, 2000; Trigwell, 2013). Family scientists have

unique experience with the need for advocacy for our work. They can bring that expertise to SoTL, providing much needed assistance in giving voice to SoTL among key constituents.

Resources for Conducting SoTL

For those interested in learning about or pursuing SoTL research, there are multiple resources across a variety of media types. In addition to sources cited in this paper, readers can find interdisciplinary SoTL scholarship published in three open access journals: *The International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, and ISSOTL's *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*. The Vanderbilt Center for Teaching (<https://my.vanderbilt.edu/sotl/>) hosts an excellent overview and guide to SoTL research. The Center for Engaged Learning at Elon University has created an outstanding series of interviews with SoTL scholars (many of whom this article cites) about SoTL at their YouTube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCNIm8Apo1feU73SPyxEXXgg>. The ISSOTL website (<http://www.issotl.com/issotl15/>) provides lists of SoTL journals, blogs, and other resources including special interest groups for members such as Advancing Undergraduate Research. SoTL “is no fast ticket to scholarly success” (Gilpin, 2009, p. 3), but it offers a serious, scholarly, and systematic way to investigate and improve teaching and learning in higher education.

Recommendations to Advance SoTL in Family Science

The family science field lacks a clear pathway for those wanting to engage in SoTL. Currently, there is little organization between and among family scientists engaged in SoTL. Certainly there is little synergy resulting from these efforts. To address these concerns and to advance SoTL in family science, we make several recommendations. First, there needs to be development of a comprehensive family science SoTL website. The site could become the “one-stop shop” for all things SoTL in the family sciences. Website organization could include similar headings that appear in this article, such as “Definitions and Conceptualizations of SoTL,” “Models for Evaluating SoTL Scholarship,” “Scholarly Questions and Types of SoTL Projects in Family Science,” and “Benefits of Engaging in SoTL Scholarship.” Additionally, this website could provide links to SoTL journals, published family science SoTL articles, and teaching centers dedicated to SoTL research. Hosting SoTL webinars and identifying SoTL-active family scientists and potential mentors could also take place through the website. We believe the natural host for this website would be The Family Science Association. We acknowledge that other SoTL websites host similar information about SoTL generally, including those listed in the last section of this article. However, many family scientists are unfamiliar with those resources and the Family Science Association website is the natural “hub” for such information in the field.

In addition to the website, we recommend a regular issue dedicated to SoTL in *Family Science Review*. If those engaged in SoTL scholarship know there will be issues dedicated to SoTL on a regular basis, they can use this for motivation and planning, which may help spur more interest in doing SoTL scholarship in family science. These priorities may also boost readership of *Family Science Review*, especially if the SoTL scholarship the journal publishes is situated at the intersection of multiple fields that overlap with family science.

We conclude this introduction manuscript on SoTL in family science by calling on all family scientists to embrace this movement, read its literature, and lend their scholarly talents toward advancing SoTL in our field.

Trent W. Maurer is a Professor of Child & Family Development in the School of Human Ecology at Georgia Southern University in Statesboro, GA 30460.

David Law is an Associate Professor of Family, Consumer and Human Development in the School of Education and Human Services at Utah State University in Roosevelt, UT.

References

- Bernstein, D. (2013). How SoTL-active faculty members can be cosmopolitan assets to an institution. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1*(1), 35-40. doi: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.35
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W., & Helland, P. (2002). Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 29*(2). Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 468 779 HE 035 247)
- Chick, N. (2013). Difference, privilege, and power in the scholarship of teaching and learning: The value of humanities SoTL. In K. McKinney (Ed.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in and across the disciplines* (pp. 152-168). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Chick, N., & Poole, G. (2014). The necessary and dual conversations in a vibrant SoTL. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 2*(1), 1-2. doi: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.2.1.1
- Cross, K. P., & Steadman, M. H. (1996). *Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching and learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Csete, J., & Li, M. (2015, March). Using bibliometric analyses for evaluating leading journals and top researchers in SoTL. Paper presented at the 2015 SoTL Commons Conference, Savannah, GA.
- Cushman, D. (2015). Demonstrating leadership. *National Council on Family Relations Report, 60*(4), 5, 7.
- DiGregorio, N., Maurer, T. W., & Pattanaik, S. (2016). Documentation of scholarship of teaching and learning trends at National Council on Family Relations annual conferences, 2006-2015. *Family Science Review, 21*(1).
- Felten, P. (2013). Principles of good practice in SoTL. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1*(1), 121-125. doi: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.121
- Gavazzi, S. M. (2013). The art of being a failure as an academic field: A cautionary tale for family science. *Family Science Review, 18*(2), 3-12. Retrieved from [http://www.familyscienceassociation.org/sites/default/files/1-%20GAVAZZI%2018\(2\).pdf](http://www.familyscienceassociation.org/sites/default/files/1-%20GAVAZZI%2018(2).pdf)

- Gavazzi, S. M., Wilson, S. M., Ganong, L., & Zvonkovic, A. (2014). Furthering the conversation on the future of the discipline of family science: Comments on the articles by Hamon & Smith and Hans. *Family Relations*, 63, 333-342. doi: 10.1111/fare.12076
- Gilpin, L. (2009). Reflective, reflexive, and recursive: The praxis of SoTL. *Mountain Rise*, 5(3), 1-5. Retrieved from <http://mountainrise.wcu.edu/index.php/MtnRise/article/viewFile/132/99>
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gunn, C., Kurtz, G., Lauridsen, K., Maurer, T. W., & Steele, G. (2010). Evolution and engagement in SoTL: Today, tomorrow, and internationally. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 4. Retrieved from <http://w3.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstotl/v4n2.html>
- Gurung, R. A. R. (2014). Getting foxy: Invoking different magisteria in the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 2(2), 109-114. doi: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.2.2.109
- Gurung, R. A. R., Ansbarg, P. I., Alexander, P. A., Lawrence, N. K., & Johnson, D. E. (2008). The state of the scholarship of teaching and learning in psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 35, 249-261.
- Hamon, R. R., & Smith, S. R. (2014). The discipline of family science and the continuing need for innovation. *Family Relations*, 63, 309-322. doi: 10.1111/fare.12068
- Hans, J. D. (2014). Whither famology? Department name trends across four decades. *Family Relations*, 63, 323-332. doi: 10.1111/fare.12075
- Hare, S. C. (1999). Using e-mail to promote cross-cultural understanding of families. *Teaching Sociology*, 27, 67-73.
- Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2014). *Engagement through partnership: Students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education*. York, United Kingdom: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/resources/engagement_through_partnership.pdf
- Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Huber, M. T., & Morreale, S. P. (Eds.). (2002). *Disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning: Exploring common ground*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

- Hutchings, P. (2000). *Opening lines: Approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning.
- Hutchings, P. (2007). Theory: The elephant in the scholarship of teaching and learning room. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1). Article 2. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol1/iss1/2>
- Hutchings, P., Huber, M. T., & Ciccone, A. (2011). *The scholarship of teaching and learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change*, 31(5), 10-15.
- Inside Higher Ed. (2015, January 29). Wisconsin governor: Faculty should teach more classes. Retrieved December 28th, 2015 from <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2015/01/29/wisconsin-governor-faculty-should-teach-more-classes>
- Kreber, C. (2013). The transformative potential of the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 1(1), 5-18. doi: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.5
- Kuvalanka, K. A., Goldberg, A. E., & Oswald, R. F. (2013). Incorporating LGBTQ issues into family courses: Instructor challenges and strategies relative to perceived teaching climate. *Family Relations*, 62, 699-713. doi: 10.1111/fare.12034
- Maurer, T. W. (2006a). Daily online extra credit quizzes and exam performance. *Journal of Teaching in Marriage & Family*, 6, 227-238. Retrieved from <http://www.familyscienceassociation.org/sites/default/files/Maurer%20online%20quizzes.pdf>
- Maurer, T. W. (2006b). Preparing students for the parent-teacher conference in early childhood education. *Journal of Teaching in Marriage & Family*, 6, 239-264. Retrieved from <http://www.familyscienceassociation.org/sites/default/files/Maurer%20preparing%20students.pdf>
- Maurer, T. W. (2006c). Cognitive dissonance or revenge? Student grades and course evaluations. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33, 176-179. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top3303_4
- Maurer, T. W. (2013). Evaluation of a classroom exercise on social distance and discrimination. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 7. Retrieved from <http://w3.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstl/v7n2.html>

- Maurer, T. W. (2014a). Process-Oriented Guided-Inquiry Learning in financial literacy education. *Forum for Family and Consumer Issues*, 19(1). Retrieved from <http://www.ncsu.edu/ffci/publications/2014/v19-n1-2014-spring/index-v19-n1-may-2014.php>
- Maurer, T. W. (2014b). Teaching financial literacy with Process-Oriented Guided-Inquiry Learning (POGIL). *Journal of Financial Education*, 40, 140-163.
- Maurer, T. W., & Kropp, J. (2015). The impact of the Immediate Feedback Assessment Technique on course evaluations. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 3(1), 31-46. doi: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.3.1.31
- Maurer, T. W., & Lee, S. (2011). Financial education with college students: Comparing peer-led and traditional classroom instruction. *Journal of Family & Economic Issues*, 32, 680-689. doi: 10.1007/s10834-011-9266-z
- Maurer, T. W. & Longfield, J. (2015). Using reading guides and on-line quizzes to improve reading compliance and quiz scores. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 9. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol9/iss1/6>
- Maurer, T. W., & Rouse-Arnett, M. (2006). Promoting critical thinking about scientific research. *Journal of Teaching in Marriage & Family*, 6, 265-284. Retrieved from <http://www.familyscienceassociation.org/sites/default/files/Maurer%20Rouse-Arnett.p>
- McKinney, K. (2003). What is the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) in higher education? *Teaching/Learning Matters*, 33(1), 6-7.
- McKinney, K. (2006). Attitudinal and structural factors contributing to challenges in the work of the scholarship of teaching and learning. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *Analyzing faculty work and rewards: Using Boyer's four domains of scholarship- New directions in institutional research*, #129, (pp. 37-50). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McKinney, K. (2007). *Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning: The challenges and joys of juggling*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McKinney, K. (2012). Increasing the impact of SoTL: Two sometimes neglected opportunities. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(1), Article 3. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol6/iss1/3><http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol6/iss1/3>
- McKinney, K. (2015). The more things change, the more they stay the same. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9 (1), Article 2. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol9/iss1/2>

- Potter, M. K., & Kustra, E. D. H. (2011). The relationship between scholarly teaching and SoTL: Models, distinctions, and clarifications. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(1), Article 23. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol5/iss1/23>
- Reinke, J., Muraco, J., & Maurer, T. W. (2016). The state of the scholarship of teaching and learning in family science. *Family Science Review*, 21(1).
- Richlin, L. (2001). Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 86, 57-68. doi: 10.1002/tl.16
- Shulman, L. S. (2000). From Minsk to Pinsk: Why a scholarship of teaching and learning? *The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1, 48-52.
- Shulman, L. S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52-59. Retrieved from <http://diyhpl.us/~bryan/papers2/paperbot/5e74b13008997b5a78da2ad81fd07317.pdf>
- Smart, L. S. (2009). Family science: The emergence of a new discipline, 1982-2007. *Family Science Review*, 14, 118-128.
- Trigwell, K. (2013). Evidence of the impact of scholarship of teaching and learning purposes. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 1(1), 95-105. doi: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.95
- Werder, C., & Otis, M. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Engaging student voices in the study of teaching and learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.